

Juduser

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 6:54 AM
To: JudTestimony
Cc: Rep. Santiago, Hilda
Subject: Opposition to SB16

Dear legislators,

I will begin my testimony by saying thank you for taking the time to read and consider my input on the rightful and respectful opposition of CGA Session 2022's SB16 Bill, both as a firearms enthusiast, instructor and gunsmith aspirant, and a father and husband.

SB16 is an obvious infringement on the 2nd Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners in this state, and has several negative implications that will inevitably follow — some of which are inherent, and what behaviors the bill seeks to correct will simply not be, as history has taught us.

Starting with the modification of the Assault Weapons Ban, banning CT "Others" is simply unfair. It goes without saying that the sentiment and reasoning behind this, is more than valid. However, prohibiting law-abiding persons from possessing an Other would work to achieve nothing other than satisfy legislators simply because "they said so". I personally cannot think of an instance where an Other was utilized to commit a crime. Crimes that were committed with a rifle of some sort, were rifles that met the criteria of an "assault weapon" at the national-federal level — not the state level in respect to Connecticut. As someone in my shoes, Others are the way to having the next best thing to what the state considers an "assault weapon", which is literally an Other plus at least one of the "scary" features (i.e., an Other without a vertical foregrip). As an enthusiast and trainer aspirant, it is imperative that I be familiar with all types of weapons systems — from shotguns, to semi-automatic rifles. It is my God-given right to be curious, and my inherent right as stated in the 2nd Amendment in the Constitution of the United States to bear arms — even if those spend most of their time unloaded and properly stored away.

Additionally to this point of banning Others, banning pistol stabilizing braces would be absolutely asinine because an Other can still be fired whether there is a stabilizing brace on it or not. Being that a stock, which is what an Other (and any other rifle-type weapon) is rightfully designed to have installed so the operator can safely utilize the firearm, is very clearly prohibited in most states, again, the next option is to utilize a stabilizing brace instead. Banning stabilizing braces will only make the ownership and operation of Others much more cumbersome and it will be for very little, if any, benefit as the point per the Bill is to mitigate gun violence. Banning braces will not contribute to the end of gun violence and is a doltish idea, at best. The same goes for banning the sale of lower receivers, and .22lr rimfire rifles with a detachable magazine and one "scary" feature. .22lr rifles are rarely ever used in any crime, and I'd motion that this is simply a result of this particular caliber being known to not be very powerful and it is generally accepted that this caliber is not adequate for self-defense by any means. It is well known that the inherent majority of all gun-related crimes that have been committed in the state of Connecticut were committed by prohibited persons — the evidence of this is practically suffocating. The Governor's disdain for illegal firearms in this state is equilateral to that for legal firearms and clearly demonstrates his sentimental and insistent disconnect and indifference between gun-toting criminals and prohibited persons — that couldn't care less for any law, regulation, or legislation — and law-abiding gun owner residents in the state of Connecticut.

Regarding the proposed stop-and-frisk juncture — as a 6-foot-5-inch tall African-American male that has a CT permit to carry and possess firearms and does regularly carry a firearm, it makes me extremely uncomfortable that this particular legislation is in the cards to pass into law. Again, a well-intended motion, but realistically, it will allow law enforcement officers to pick and choose who to harass when they "suspect" that that individual either is in possession of a firearm (regardless of if legally or not) or plans to commit a crime. This means I can be walking down the street (in a non gun-free zone with my 4yr old child) and be stopped by a police officer even though I've done nothing wrong. Sure, the officer may have no ill intent and is simply doing his/her/their job and following orders to perhaps stop and frisk known licensed persons whenever the opportunity presents itself, but this can lead to an unhealthy power struggle between local law enforcement agencies and state legislature, and further tension between legal gun owners and law

enforcement overall. This will inevitably cause more divisiveness in Connecticut alone, not to mention the uproar that will occur when international media channels catch wind of these changes. Because of how African-Americans have been treated by law enforcement in general since, effectively, the beginning of the United States (but certainly in the past 50-60 years), I am personally not averse to showing my Permit to any law enforcement officer when asked for it, because I am forever confident that I am abiding by all CT state laws pertaining to the possession (including on-person carrying/concealment) and storage of firearms. I have nothing to hide, and do not want to cause a fuss with any law enforcement officer, regardless of their actual intent. But to give law enforcement officers the "go ahead" to stop and frisk whenever they feel like, is simply inane. This is also unconstitutional and opens the door to harassment and profiling, which is exactly what people that look like me have been trying to stop for generations. Let's also not forget that this archaic plan by the Governor directly contradicts the idea of the laws that the Governor signed last year to limit police engagement in urban communities. There is no doubt that there will be undue emphasis on urban communities with these stop and frisk procedures, which is wholly unjust and further corroborates the notion that harassment and profiling will be inevitable as a result of this change in policy.

CGA-2022-SB16 is not going to address the issues that the Governor seeks to fix. The fact that this Bill, in the grand scheme of things, is meant to implement the Governor's purported budget recommendations is another clear indicator that the Governor is out of touch with the [law-abiding] 2nd Amendment community in the state that works day in and day out to protect the lackluster set of freedoms we're left with that are continuously infringed upon — both by the federal and state government(s). Allow me to be clear, that I feel as though I speak for a grand majority of fellow 2nd Amendment supporters, the ask of us is not to make Connecticut a 2nd Amendment sanctuary, but for the Governor to strongly reconsider the motions set forth in this proposed Bill, with respect to the opinions of my fellow law-abiding 2nd Amendment brothers, sisters, and non-binary folks; with the respect of my law-abiding firearms instructors/educators; my law-abiding gunsmiths; my law-abiding ammunition manufacturers; my fellow law-abiding gunowners with families — spouses and children alike; Tom Davis of Tom's Firearms in Naugatuck; Mary and Martin of Paravant Group and LoMag Consulting; the staff at Delta Arsenal; Mad Pig Customs; BattleWerx; Greyson Guns; Blue Trail; Kinetic Development Group; ALL of the listed entities and their families — their opinions deserve to be heard and considered, too. We only want what is in the best interest of The People, as the Founding Fathers intended.

Thank you for your time.

Montel Gray
954.707.2497